

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 2-18 are now present in the application. Claims 4, 7, 12, 15, 17 and 18 have been amended based on the Amendment dated October 27, 2006. Claims 2, 5 and 8 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 9 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants greatly appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter by the Examiner.

By the present amendment, claims 2, 5 and 8 have been rewritten in independent form to include the subject matter of their base claim 1, which were indicated by the Examiner as including allowable subject matter. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 2, 5 and 8 and their dependent claims 3, 6 and 9-11 are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4, 7, 12, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, U.S. Patent No. 4,852,642. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

Since claim 1 has been cancelled and claims 4, 7, 12, 17 and 18 have been re-directed to allowable claim 2, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4, 7, 12, 17 and 18 clearly define the present invention over the reference relied on by the Examiner at least due to their dependency from allowable independent claim 2. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a three (3) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application and the required fee is attached herewith.

Application No. 10/537,311
Supplemental Amendment dated December 27, 2006
Reply to After Final Office Action of June 27, 2006

Docket No.: 0630-2329PUS1

Page 8 of 8

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

J By Esther Chou #40,953
James T. Eller, Jr.
Registration No.: 39,538
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant